



June 2 meeting

Dave Bartus to: KCON461, DGOS461, RSKI461, CWAHA461,
Dave Bartus, JAYR461

05/26/2010 09:25 AM

Cc: Rick Albright

I guess I'm a bit confused about the request "prepared to present your perspective (with regulatory or technical justification) of what groundwater monitoring for the operating units (trench 31, 34 and 94) should look like." This work has already been done multiple times - if it is necessary to do so again, I'll be happy to. That said, I think its important to point out that both EPA and Ecology have long since documented perspectives with regulatory and technical justification on this issue.

First, I'd point out the Hanford Ground Water Strategy, DOE/RL-2002-59, which was signed by both EPA and Ecology. At the time this document was developed, Dib was the lead technical representative of Ecology, so I presume that its contents reflect the official view of Ecology with respect to Trenches 31 and 34. See in particular, Sections 4.1 and C.1.



RL-2002-59.pdf

I'd also point out the regulatory analysis I prepared in August of 2008. I've provided this document on several occasions to Ecology, so it should not be new information. This document presents a very thorough analysis of the technical and regulatory arguments, so I'd present this as the requested documentation of EPA's perspectives and regulatory and policy justification of groundwater monitoring for Trenches 31, 34 and 94.



Regulatory Analysis - groundwater monitoring.doc

Finally, EPA perspectives are reflected in the meeting notes from 4/6/2010. The groundwater aspects of this document are fully consistent with the two other documents noted above. These notes were, as I understand events, the basis for Deb's e-mail of 4/9/2010 identifying unspecified groundwater issues that must be resolved before proceeding further.



Meeting Notes 04062010.doc